EXHIBIT D

1	Charles K. Verhoeven (Bar No. 170151) charlesverhoeven@quinnemanuel.com David A. Perlson (Bar No. 209502) davidperlson@quinnemanuel.com Melissa Baily (Bar No. 237649) melissabaily@quinnemanuel.com John Neukom (Bar No. 275887) johnneukom@quinnemanuel.com Jordan Jaffe (Bar No. 254886)	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	Facsimile: (415) 875-6700	
9	Attorneys for WAYMO LLC	
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
12	WAYMO LLC,	CASE NO. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA
13	Plaintiff,	
14	VS.	WAYMO'S DAMAGES CONTENTIONS PURSUANT TO PATENT LOCAL RULE
15	UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING	3-8
16	LLC,	
17	Defendants.	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		CASE No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

WAYMO'S DAMAGES CONTENTIONS

Pursuant to N.D. Cal. Local Patent Rule 3-8, Waymo LLC ("Waymo") provides the following statement regarding its damages stemming from Defendants' patent infringement in this case:

Waymo believes it has suffered and is suffering irreparable harm as a result of Defendants' patent infringement, particularly to the extent Defendants have infringed Waymo's patents for the purpose (and with the result) of fast-tracking its LiDAR development. Waymo accordingly plans to seek injunctive relief.

In addition, Waymo believes it is entitled to damages for Defendants' past patent infringement, including damages based on a calculation of lost profits or an amount no less than a reasonable royalty. To the extent an injunction is not granted, Waymo will also seek damages, based on the same theories, tied to any continuing use of Waymo's patents.

With respect to the factual bases for Waymo's contentions, Waymo refers to and incorporates by reference the briefing, declarations and evidence submitted in connection with its Motion for a Preliminary Injunction (Dkt. 25 and related filings), as well as the Court's order granting-in-part the same (Dkt. 426). These facts include that Defendants' use of the patented technology saved them time and resources with respect to developing LiDAR and entering the relevant markets. These facts also include that Waymo and Defendants are direct competitors with respect to entering the relevant markets.

Discovery in this case is ongoing. Waymo has sought permission from Special Master Cooper to serve damages-related discovery. Such discovery was not included in Waymo's initial three sets of requests for production, as Waymo had not anticipated that requests for production would be limited in number. Accordingly, Waymo does not have all of the information that it needs to formulate an appropriate "computation[] of damages" at this time. To calculate damages stemming from Defendants' patent infringement, Waymo expects to rely on the following information, to the extent it is produced by either side in this case (or by relevant third parties):

- Estimates of future profits and cash flows from both Waymo and Defendants;
- The parties' assessments and projections regarding the relevant markets, competition therein, and their respective competitive position;